

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspho.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,735	02/06/2002	Scott T. Holmes	38190/234784	8733
826	7590 05/05/2004		EXAMINER	
ALSTON & BIRD LLP			KOCH, GEORGE R	
	MERICA PLAZA	TTT: 4000	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	TRYON STREET, SU E. NC 28280-4000	11E 4000	1734	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/068,735	HOLMES ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George R. Koch III	1734	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	iress
THE REPLY FILED 07 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of this applications and the same of this application (a) a timely filed amendment who peal (with appeal fee); or (3) a ting	nich nlaces the appli	ication in
	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailir	ng date of the final rejection.	the final rejection which o	orielater In no
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this vevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W.	r than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date AS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TI	HE FINAL REJECTION.	See MPEP
706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shorte (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	tension and the corresponding amount of the	n the final Office action: o	r (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 the strength of	nt's Brief must be filed within the CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissa	period set forth in lof the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered			
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require fu	rther consideration and/or search	n (see NOTE below)	;
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	te below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or			
(d) they present additional claims without can	celing a corresponding number of	of finally rejected cla	ims.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s): See Continuation She	eet.	
Newly proposed or amended claim(s)wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s).			
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ reques application in condition for allowance because	: See Continuation Sheet.		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmexplanation of how the new or amended claim	nent(s) a)□ will not be entered o s would be rejected is provided b	r b)⊡ will be entere elow or appended.	d and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follo	ws:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>2-4 and 9</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: 1,5-8,10 and 11.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 12-19.			

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)

U.S. Paters and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) 5/1/64

10. A Other: INTERVIEW SUMMARY

RICHARD CRISPINO SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINED TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1778

Application No.

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejections of claims 2, 3, 4 and 9 have been overcome on the basis of the arguments presented and the interview summary from 4/6/2004. As to claims 2, 3 and 9, the references do not disclose irradation at a plurality of zones. As to claim 4, the references do not suggest monitoring past the compaction region.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With regard to claim 1, the rejection is maintaine for the reasons previously presented. Krause discloses the motivation for incorporating a laser diode array.